arXiv:1511.02782v2 [math.LO] 27 Nov 2015

On the construction of fully interpreted formal languages which posses their truth predicates

S. Heikkilä
Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Oulu
BOX 3000, FIN-90014, Oulu, Finland
E-mail: sheikki@cc.oulu.fi

November 30, 2015

Shorttitle: Languages which posses their truth predicates

Abstract

We shall first construct by ordinary recursion method subsets to the set D of Gödel numbers of the sentences of a language $\mathcal{L}$. That language is formed by the sentences of a fully interpreted formal language L, called an MA language, and sentences containing a monadic predicate letter T. From the class of the constructed subsets of D we extract one set U by transfinite recursion method. Interpret those sentences whose Gödel numbers are in U as true, and their negations as false. These sentences together form an MA language. It is a sublanguage of $\mathcal{L}$ having L as its sublanguage, and T is its truth predicate.

MSC: 00A30, 03B10, 47H04, 47H10, 68Q45

Keywords: language, formal, fully interpreted, sentence, Gödel number, truth predicate, fixed point.

1 Introduction

In [4] a theory of truth is defined for certain sublanguages of a language $\mathcal{L}$ which is the first order language $L = \{\in\}$ of set theory augmented by a monadic predicate T. The interpretation of L is determined by the minimal model M constructed in [2] for ZF set theory. This interpretation makes L fully interpreted, i.e., its sentences are either true or false. The sublanguages for which a theory of truth is defined belong to a class of sublanguages of $\mathcal{L}$. Languages of that class are denoted by $\mathcal{L}_U$, where U is a subset of the set D of the Gödel numbers of sentences of $\mathcal{L}$. The Gödel numbers of sentences of $\mathcal{L}_U$ belong to the set $G(U) \cup F(U)$, where the subsets $G(U)$ and $F(U)$ of D are told to satisfy the following rules ('iff' abbreviates 'if and only if'):

(r1) If A is a sentence of L, then the Gödel number $\#A$ of A is in $G(U)$ iff A is true in the interpretation of L, and in $F(U)$ iff A is false in the interpretation of L.

(r2) Let $\mathbf{n}$ be a numeral. $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\mathbf{n}$ is the numeral $\lceil A \rceil$ of the Gödel number of a sentence A of $\mathcal{L}$ and $\#A$ is in U. $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $F(U)$ iff $\mathbf{n} = \lceil A \rceil$, where A is a sentence of $\mathcal{L}$ and $\#[\neg A]$ is in U.

In the next rules (r3)–(r7) A and B denote sentences of $\mathcal{L}$.

(r3) Negation rule: $\#[\neg A]$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\#A$ is in $F(U)$, and in $F(U)$ iff $\#A$ is in $G(U)$.

(r4) Disjunction rule: $\#[A \vee B]$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\#A$ or $\#B$ is in $G(U)$, and in $F(U)$ iff $\#A$ and $\#B$ are in $F(U)$.

(r5) Conjunction rule: $\#[A \wedge B]$ is in $G(U)$ iff both $\#A$ and $\#B$ are in $G(U)$. $\#[A \wedge B]$ is in $F(U)$ iff $\#A$ or $\#B$ is in $F(U)$.

(r6) Implication rule: $\#[A \to B]$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\#A$ is in $F(U)$ or $\#B$ is in $G(U)$. $\#[A \to B]$ is in $F(U)$ iff $\#A$ is in $G(U)$ and $\#B$ is in $F(U)$.

(r7) Biconditionality rule: $\#[A \leftrightarrow B]$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\#A$ and $\#B$ are both in $G(U)$ or both in $F(U)$, and in $F(U)$ iff $\#A$ is in $G(U)$ and $\#B$ is in $F(U)$ or $\#A$ is in $F(U)$ and $\#B$ is in $G(U)$.

Assuming that the set X of numerals of Gödel numbers of sentences of $\mathcal{L}$ is the intended domain of discourse for T, the following rules are presented for $\exists x T(x)$ and $\forall x T(x)$:

(r8) $\#[\exists x T(x)]$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $G(U)$ for some $\mathbf{n} \in X$, and $\#[\exists x T(x)]$ is in $F(U)$ iff $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $F(U)$ for every $\mathbf{n} \in X$.

(r9) $\#[\forall x T(x)]$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $G(U)$ for every $\mathbf{n} \in X$, and $\#[\forall x T(x)]$ is in $F(U)$ iff $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $F(U)$ at least for one $\mathbf{n} \in X$.

In [5] the above considerations are extended to the case when the language L is assumed to be mathematically agreeable (shortly MA). By Chomsky's definition (cf. [1]) a "language is a set (finite or infinite) of sentences of finite length, and constructed out of finite sets of symbols". Allowing also countable sets of symbols, we say that L is an MA language if it satisfies the following conditions.

(i) The syntax of L contains a countable syntax of the first-order predicate logic with equality (cf., e.g., [6, II.5]), natural numbers in variables and their names, numerals in terms.
(ii) L is fully interpreted.
(iii) Classical truth tables (cf. e.g., [6, p.3]) are valid for the logical connectives $\neg$, $\vee$, $\wedge$, $\rightarrow$ and $\leftrightarrow$ of sentences of L.
(iv) Classical rules of truth hold for $\forall x P(x)$ and $\exists x P(x)$ where P is a predicate of L.

Any countable first-order formal language, equipped with a consistent theory interpreted by a countable model, and containing natural numbers and numerals, is an MA language. A classical example is the language of arithmetic with its standard model and interpretation.
Basic ingredients in the approach of [5] are:
1. An MA language L (base language).
2. A monadic predicate letter T.
3. The language $\mathcal{L}$, which has sentences of L, $T(\mathbf{n})$, where $\mathbf{n}$ is a numeral, $\forall x T(x)$ and $\exists x T(x)$ as its basic sentences, and which is closed under logical connectives $\neg$, $\vee$, $\wedge$, $\rightarrow$ and $\leftrightarrow$.
4. The set D of Gödel numbers of sentences of $\mathcal{L}$ in its fixed Gödel numbering.

Neither in [4] nor in [5] the sets $G(U)$ and $F(U)$ satisfying rules (r1)–(r9) are shown to exist. Our main task is to construct sets $G(U)$ and $F(U)$, and prove that they satisfy rules (r1)–(r9), and the following rules when $\#[\exists x \neg T(x)]$ and $\#[\forall x \neg T(x)]$ are added to basic sentences of $\mathcal{L}$.

(r10) $\#[\exists x \neg T(x)]$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $F(U)$ for some $\mathbf{n} \in X$, and $\#[\exists x \neg T(x)]$ is in $F(U)$ iff $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $G(U)$ for every $\mathbf{n} \in X$.

(r11) $\#[\forall x \neg T(x)]$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $F(U)$ for every $\mathbf{n} \in X$, and $\#[\forall x \neg T(x)]$ is in $F(U)$ iff $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $G(U)$ at least for one $\mathbf{n} \in X$.

Because of the recursive construction of sets $G(U)$ we revise proofs given in [4, 5] for properties of sets $G(U)$ and $F(U)$. Some of them are used in [4, Theorem 4.1] to prove by transfinite recursion method the existence of consistent fixed points U of G, i.e., subsets U of D which satisfy $U = G(U)$, and for no sentence A of $\mathcal{L}$ the Gödel numbers of both A and $\neg A$ are in U. Among them there is the smallest one which is contained in every consistent fixed point of G.

To the smallest consistent fixed point U of G there corresponds a sublanguage $\mathcal{L}_0$ of $\mathcal{L}$ which has $G(U) \cup F(U)$ as the set of Gödel numbers of its sentences. As in [4, 5], define an interpretation for sentences of $\mathcal{L}_0$ as follows. A sentence A of $\mathcal{L}_0$ is interpreted as true iff its Gödel number $\#A$ is in $G(U)$, and as false iff $\#A$ is in $F(U)$. The so defined theory of truth for $\mathcal{L}_0$ is shown in [4, Theorem 3.1] to conform well with the eight norms presented for theories of truth in [7]. T is called a truth predicate for $\mathcal{L}_0$, because T-biconditionality: $A \leftrightarrow T(\lceil A \rceil)$, is shown in [5, Lemma 4.1] to be true in that interpretation for all sentences A of $\mathcal{L}_0$ ($T(\lceil A \rceil)$ stands for 'A is true'). $\mathcal{L}_0$ is fully interpreted because $G(U]$ and $F(U)$ are separated by Lemma 4.1.
L is by rule (r1) a sublanguage of $\mathcal{L}_0$. Moreover, a sentence A of L is by [5, Lemma 4.2] true, respectively false, in the interpretation of L if and only if A is true, respectively false, in the interpretation of $\mathcal{L}_0$.
$\mathcal{L}_0$ is an MA language. By above results it satisfies properties (i) and (ii). Rules (r1)–(r11) and the above defined interpretation imply that properties (iii) and (iv) are valid by assuming that T and $\neg T$ are the only predicates of $\mathcal{L}_0$ which are not predicates of L.
Main tools used in proofs are ZF set theory and classical logic.

2 Recursive construction of sets $G(U)$

Let L, T, $\mathcal{L}$ and D be as in the Introduction, and let W denote the set of Gödel numbers of all those sentences of L which are true in the interpretation of L. Given a subset U of D, denote

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(U) =&\{\#T(\mathbf{n})\colon\ \mathbf{n} = \ulcorner A\urcorner, \text{ where } A \text{ is a sentence of } \mathcal{L} \text{ and } \#A \text{ is in } U\},\\ D_2(U) =&\{\#[\neg T(\mathbf{n})]\colon\ \mathbf{n} = \ulcorner A\urcorner, \text{ where } A \text{ is a sentence of } \mathcal{L} \text{ and } \#[\neg A] \text{ is in } U\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

We shall construct subsets $G_n(U)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, of D recursively as follows.
Define

$$G_0(U) = \begin{cases} W \text{ if } U = \emptyset,\\ W \cup D_1(U) \cup \{\#[\exists x T(x)], \#[\neg\forall x \neg T(x)]\} \text{ if } \emptyset \subset U \subset D, \text{ and } D_2(U) = \emptyset,\\ W \cup D_1(U) \cup D_2(U) \cup \{\#[\exists x T(x)], \#[\neg\forall x \neg T(x)]\}\\ \cup\{\#[\neg\forall x T(x)]\#[\exists x \neg T(x)]\} \ \text{ if } \emptyset \subset U \subset D, \text{ and } D_2(U) \neq \emptyset,\\ W \cup D_1(U) \cup D_2(U) \cup \{\#[\exists x T(x)], \#[\neg\exists x T(x)], \#[\forall x T(x)], \#[\neg\forall x T(x)]\}\\ \cup\{\#[\forall x \neg T(x)], \#[\neg\forall x \neg T(x)], \#[\exists x \neg T(x)]\#[\neg\exists x \neg T(x)] \text{ if } U = D. \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

Let A and B denote sentences of $\mathcal{L}$. When $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and $G_n(U)$ is defined, denote

$$\begin{aligned} G_n^1(U) =&\{\#[A \vee B] : \#A \text{ or } \#B \text{ is in } G_n(U)\},\\ G_n^2(U) =&\{\#[A \wedge B] : \#A \text{ and } \#B \text{ are in } G_n(U)\},\\ G_n^3(U) =&\{\#[A \to B] : \#[\neg A] \text{ or } \#B \text{ is in } G_n(U)\},\\ G_n^4(U) =&\{\#[A \leftrightarrow B] : \text{both } \#A \text{ and } \#B \text{ or both } \#[\neg A] \text{ and } \#[\neg B] \text{ are in } G_n(U)\},\\ G_n^5(U) =&\{\#[\neg(A \vee B)] : \#[\neg A] \text{ and } \#[\neg B] \text{ are in } G_n(U)\},\\ G_n^6(U) =&\{\#[\neg(A \wedge B)] : \#[\neg A] \text{ or } \#[\neg B] \text{ is in } G_n(U)\},\\ G_n^7(U) =&\{\#[\neg(A \to B)] : \#A \text{ and } \#[\neg B] \text{ are in } G_n(U)\},\\ G_n^8(U) =&\{\#[\neg(A \leftrightarrow B)] : \text{both } \#A \text{ and } \#[\neg B] \text{ or both } \#[\neg A] \text{ and } \#B \text{ are in } G_n(U)\},\\ G_n^9(U) =&\{\#[\neg(\neg A)] : \#A \text{ is in } G_n(U)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

and define

$$G_{n+1}(U) = G_n(U) \cup \bigcup_{k=1}^{9} G_n^k(U). \tag{2.4}$$

Because $\mathcal{L}$ is closed with respect to connectives $\neg$, $\vee$, $\wedge$, $\to$ and $\leftrightarrow$, it follows from the above construction that $G_n(U)$ is defined for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Moreover, $G_n(U) \subseteq G_{n+1}(U)$ and $G_n^k(U) \subseteq G_{n+1}^k(U)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $k = 1, \ldots, 9$. In particular, we can define

$$G(U) = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} G_n(U). \tag{2.5}$$

Because every set $G_n(U)$ is a subset of D, then also $G(U)$ is contained in D.

3 Validity of rules (r1)–(r11)

Now we are ready to prove our main result.

Theorem 3.1. *Let U be a subset of D, and let the subsets $G(U)$ and $F(U)$ of D be defined by* (2.5)*, and by*

$$F(U) = \{\#A : \#[\neg A] \in G(U)\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Then rules (r1)–(r11) are valid.

Proof. Let A be a sentence of L. It follows from the construction of $G(U)$ that $\#A$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\#A$ is in W, i.e., iff A is true in the interpretation of L. Definition (3.1) of $F(U)$ implies that $\#A$ is in $F(U)$ iff $\#[\neg A]$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\neg A$ is true in the interpretation of L. Because L is an MA language, then $\neg A$ is true in the interpretation of L iff A is false in the interpretation of L. This proves (r1).

Let $\mathbf{n}$ be a numeral. The construction of $G(U)$ implies that $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $G(U)$ iff it is in $D_1(U)$, i.e., iff $\mathbf{n} = \lceil A \rceil$, where A is a sentence of $\mathcal{L}$ and $\#A$ is in U. $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is by (3.1) in $F(U)$ iff $\#[\neg T(\mathbf{n})]$ is in $G(U)$ iff (by the construction of $G(U)$) $\#[\neg T(\mathbf{n})]$ is in $D_2(U)$ iff (by the definition of $D_2(U)$) $\mathbf{n} = \lceil A \rceil$, where A is a sentence of $\mathcal{L}$ and $\#[\neg A]$ is in U. This ends the proof of (r2).

In the proof of (r3) we need the following auxiliary result.

(r0) If A is a sentence of $\mathcal{L}$, then $\#[\neg(\neg A)]$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\#A$ is in $G(U)$.

Assume first that $\#[\neg(\neg A)]$ is in $G_0(U)$. Then $\#[\neg(\neg A)]$ is in W, so that sentence $\neg(\neg A)$ is true in the interpretation of L. Since L is an MA language, then A is true in the interpretation of L. Thus $\#A$ is in W, and hence in $G(U)$.
Assume next that the least of those n for which $\#[\neg(\neg A)]$ is in $G_n(U)$ is > 0. The definition of $G_n(U)$ implies that if $\#[\neg(\neg A)]$ is in $G_n(U)$, then $\#[\neg(\neg A)]$ is in $G^9_{n-1}(U)$, so that $\#A$ is in $G_{n-1}(U)$, and hence in $G(U)$.
Thus $\#A$ is in $G(U)$ if $\#[\neg(\neg A)]$ is in $G_n(U)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, or equivalently, if $\#[\neg(\neg A)]$ is in $G(U)$.
Conversely, if $\#A$ is in $G(U)$, then it is in $G_n(U)$ for some n, so that $\#[\neg(\neg A)]$ is in $G^9_n(U)$, and hence in $G_{n+1}(U)$, and thus in $G(U)$. This concludes the proof of (r0).

To prove (r3), let A be a sentence of $\mathcal{L}$. It follows from (3.1) that $\#[\neg A]$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\#A$ is in $F(U)$. Consider next the case when $\#[\neg A]$ is in $F(U)$. By (3.1) this holds iff $\#[\neg(\neg A)]$ is in $G(U)$ iff (by (r0)) $\#A$ is in $G(U)$. This ends the proof of (r3).

Let A and B be sentences of $\mathcal{L}$. If $\#A$ or $\#B$ is in $G(U)$, there is by (2.5) an $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\#A$ or $\#B$ is in $G_n(U)$. Thus $\#[A \vee B]$ is in $G^1_n(U)$, and hence in $G(U)$.
Conversely, assume that $\#[A \vee B]$ is in $G(U)$. Then there is by (2.5) an $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\#[A \vee B]$ is in $G_n(U)$. Assume first that $n = 0$. If $\#[A \vee B]$ is in $G_0(U)$, it is in W. Thus $A \vee B$ is true in the interpretation of L. Because L is an MA language, then A or B is true in the interpretation of L, i.e., $\#A$ or $\#B$ is in W, and hence in $G(U)$.
Assume next that the least of those n for which $\#[A \vee B]$ is in $G_n(U)$ is > 0. Then $\#[A \vee B]$ is in $G^1_{n-1}(U)$, so that $\#A$ or $\#B$ is in $G_{n-1}(U)$, and hence in $G(U)$.
Consequently, $\#[A \vee B]$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\#A$ or $\#B$ is in $G(U)$.

It follows from (3.1) that
(a) $\#[A \vee B]$ is in $F(U)$ iff $\#[\neg(A \vee B)]$ is in $G(U)$.
If $\#[\neg(A \vee B)]$ is in $G(U)$, there is by (2.5) an $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\#[\neg(A \vee B)]$ is in $G_n(U)$. Assume that $n = 0$. If $\#[\neg(A \vee B)]$ is in $G_0(U)$, it is in W. Then $\neg(A \vee B)$ is true in the interpretation of L, so that (L is an MA language) $\neg A$ and $\neg B$ are true in the interpretation of L, i.e., $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ are in W, and hence in $G(U)$.
Assume next that the least of those n for which $\#[\neg(A \vee B)]$ is in $G_n(U)$ is > 0. Then $\#[\neg(A \vee B)]$ is in $G^5_{n-1}(U)$, so that $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ are in $G_{n-1}(U)$, and hence in $G(U)$. Thus, $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ are in $G(U)$ if $\#[\neg(A \vee B)]$ is in $G(U)$.
Conversely, if $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ are in $G(U)$, there exist by (2.5) $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\#[\neg A]$ is in $G_{n_1}(U)$ and $\#[\neg B]$ is in $G_{n_2}(U)$. Denoting $n = \max\{n_1, n_2\}$, then both $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ are in $G_n(U)$. This result and the definition of $G^5_n(U)$ imply that $\#[\neg(A \vee B)]$ is in $G^5_n(U)$, and hence in $G(U)$. Consequently,
(b) $\#[\neg(A \vee B)]$ is in $G(U)$ iff $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ are in $G(U)$ iff (by (3.1)) $\#A$ and $\#B$ are in $F(U)$.
Thus, by (a) and (b), $\#[A \vee B]$ is in $F(U)$ iff $\#A$ and $\#B$ are in $F(U)$. This concludes the proof of (r4).

The proofs for the validity of rules (r5)–(r7) are similar to that given above for rule (r4).

$\#[\exists x T(x)]$ is in $G(U)$ iff (by construction of $G(U)$) $\#[\exists x T(x)]$ is in $G_0(U)$ iff U is nonempty iff (by (r2)) $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $G(U)$ for some numeral $\mathbf{n} \in X$.
$\#[\exists x T(x)]$ is in $F(U)$ iff (by (r3)) $\#[\neg\exists x T(x)]$ is in $G(U)$ iff (by the construction of $G(U)$) $\#[\neg\exists x T(x)]$ is in $G_0(U)$ iff $U = D$ iff (by (r2)) $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $F(U)$ for every numeral $\mathbf{n} \in X$. This concludes the proof of (r8).

$\#[\forall x T(x)]$ is in $G(U)$ iff (by construction of $G(U)$) $\#[\forall x T(x)]$ is in $G_0(U)$ iff $U = D$ iff (by (r2)) $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $G(U)$ for every numeral $\mathbf{n} \in X$.
$\#[\forall x T(x)]$ is in $F(U)$ iff (by (r3)) $\#[\neg\forall x T(x)]$ is in $G(U)$ iff (by the construction of $G(U)$) $\#[\neg\forall x T(x)]$ is in $G_0(U)$ iff $D_2(U)$ is nonempty iff $\#[\neg T(\mathbf{n})]$ is in $G(U)$ at least for one numeral $\mathbf{n} \in X$ iff $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $F(U)$ at least for one numeral $\mathbf{n} \in X$. This ends the proof of rule (r9).

Similar reasoning as in the above proofs of (r8) and (r9) can be used to verify that rules (r10) and (r11) are valid. □

4 Properties of $G(U)$ and $F(U)$ when U is consistent

In this section we shall prove some properties of $G(U)$ and $F(U)$, where U is consistent. They are used in [4] to prove the existence of consistent fixed points of G.

Lemma 4.1. *Let U be a consistent subset of D. Then $G(U) \cap F(U) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. If A is in L, then by rule (r1) $\#A$ is not in $G(U) \cap F(U)$ because L is fully interpreted. Let $\mathbf{n}$ be a numeral. $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $G_0(U)$ iff it is in $D_1(U)$ iff $\mathbf{n} = \lceil A \rceil$, where $\#A$ is in U. $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $F(U)$ iff $\#[\neg T(\mathbf{n})]$ is in $G(U)$, or equivalently, in $D_2(U)$ iff $\mathbf{n} = \lceil A \rceil$, where $\#[\neg A]$ is in U. Thus $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ cannot be both in $G(U)$ and in $F(U)$, and hence not in $G_0(U) \cap F(U)$, because the consistency of U implies that $\#A$ and $\#[\neg A]$ cannot be both in U.

If U is empty, then none of the Gödel numbers $\#[\exists x T(x)]$,$\#[\neg\exists x T(x)]$, $\#[\forall x T(x)]$,$\#[\neg\forall x T(x)]$, $\#[\forall x\neg T(x)]$,$\#[\neg\forall x\neg T(x)]$, $\#[\exists x\neg T(x)]$, and $\#[\neg\exists x\neg T(x)]$ is in $G_0(U)$. Hence they are not in $G_0(U)\cap F(U)$.
Assume next that U is not empty. Because U is consistent, it is a proper subset of D. Then rules (r1), (r8)-(r11), result (r0) and definitions (2.2) and (3.1) imply that not any of the above listed Gödel numbers is both in $G_0(U)$ and in $F(U)$, and hence in $G_0(U)\cap F(U)$.
The above results and the definition of $G_0(U)$ imply that the induction hypothesis:

(h0) $G_n(U)\cap F(U)=\emptyset$

holds for $n=0$. If $\#[A\vee B]$ is in $G_n^1(U)\cap F(U)$, then $\#A$ or $\#B$ is in $G_n(U)$, and both $\#A$ and $\#B$ are in $F(U)$ by (r4), so that $\#A$ or $\#B$ is in $G_n(U)\cap F(U)$. Hence, if (h0) holds, then $G_n^1(U)\cap F(U)=\emptyset$.
$\#[A\wedge B]$ cannot be in $G_n^2(U)\cap F(U)$, for otherwise both $\#A$ and $\#B$ are in $G_n(U)$, and at least one of $\#A$ and $\#B$ is in $F(U)$, so that $\#A$ or $\#B$ is in $G_n(U)\cap F(U)$, contradicting with (h0). Thus $G_n^2(U)\cap F(U)=\emptyset$ if (h0) holds.
If $\#[A\to B]$ is in $G_n^3(U)\cap F(U)$, then $\#[\neg A]$ or $\#B$ is in $G_n(U)$ and both $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#B$ are in $F(U)$. But then $\#[\neg A]$ or $\#B$ is in $G_n(U)\cap F(U)$. Thus $G_n^3(U)\cap F(U)=\emptyset$ if (h0) holds.
If $\#[A\leftrightarrow B]$ is in $G_n^4(U)\cap F(U)$, then both $\#A$ and $\#B$ or both $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ are in $G_n(U)$, and both $\#[A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ or both $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[B]$ are in $F(U)$. Then one of Gödel numbers $\#A$, $\#B$, $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ is in $G_n(U)\cap F(U)$, contradicting with (h0). Consequently, $G_n^4(U)\cap F(U)=\emptyset$ if (h0) holds.
If $\#[\neg(A\vee B)]$ is in $G_n^5(U)\cap F(U)$, then $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ are in $G_n(U)$, and $\#[A\vee B]$ is in $G(U)$, i.e., $\#A$ or $\#B$ is in $G(U)$, or equivalently, $\#[\neg A]$ or $\#[\neg B]$ is in $F(U)$. Thus $\#[\neg A]$ or $\#[\neg B]$ is in $G_n(U)\cap F(U)$. Hence, if (h0) holds, then $G_n^5(U)\cap F(U)=\emptyset$.
If $\#[\neg(A\wedge B)]$ is in $G_n^6(U)\cap F(U)$, then $\#[\neg A]$ or $\#[\neg B]$ is in $G_n(U)$, and $\#[A\wedge B]$ is in $G(U)$, or equivalently, $\#A$ and $\#B$ are in $G(U)$, i.e., $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ are in $F(U)$. Consequently, $\#[\neg A]$ or $\#[\neg B]$ is in $G_n(U)\cap F(U)$, contradicting with (h0). Thus $G_n^6(U)\cap F(U)=\emptyset$ if (h0) holds.
If $\#[\neg(A\to B)]$ is in $G_n^7(U)\cap F(U)$, then $\#A$ and $\#[\neg B]$ are in $G_n(U)$, and $\#[A\to B]$ is in $G(U)$, i.e., $\#[\neg A]$ or $\#B$ is in $G(U)$, or equivalently, $\#A$ or $\#[\neg B]$ is in $F(U)$. Thus $\#A$ or $\#[\neg B]$ is in $G_n(U)\cap F(U)$. Hence, if (h0) holds, then $G_n^7(U)\cap F(U)=\emptyset$.
$\#[\neg(A\leftrightarrow B)]$ cannot be in $G_n^8(U)\cap F(U)$, for otherwise both $\#[A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ or both $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[B]$ are in $G_n(U)$, and $\#[A\leftrightarrow B]$ is in $G(U)$, i.e., both $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ or both $\#A$ and $\#B$ are in $F(U)$. Thus one of Gödel numbers $\#A$, $\#B$, $\#[\neg A]$ and $\#[\neg B]$ is in $G_n(U)\cap F(U)$, contradicting with (h0). Thus (h0) implies that $G_n^8(U)\cap F(U)=\emptyset$.
If $\#[\neg(\neg A)]$ would be in $G_n^9(U)\cap F(U)$, then $\#A$ would be in $G_n(U)$ and $\#[\neg(\neg A)]$, or equivalently, by (r0), $\#A$ would be in $F(U)$, so that $\#A$ would be in $G_n(U)\cap F(U)$. Consequently, $G_n^9(U)\cap F(U)=\emptyset$ if (h0) holds.
Because $G_{n+1}(U)=G_n(U)\cup\bigcup_{k=1}^9 G_n^k(U)$, the above results imply that $G_{n+1}(U)\cap F(U)=\emptyset$ if (h0) holds. Since it holds when $n=0$, the above proof shows by induction that it holds for all $n\in\mathbb{N}_0$.
If $\#A$ is in $G(U)$, it is by (2.5) in $G_n(U)$ for some $n\in\mathbb{N}_0$. Because (h0) holds, then $\#A$ is not in $F(U)$. Consequently, $G(U)\cap F(U)=\emptyset$. □

Lemma 4.2. *If U is a consistent subset of D, then both $G(U)$ and $F(U)$ are consistent.*

Proof. If $G(U)$ is not consistent, then there is such a sentence A of $\mathcal{L}$, that $\#A$ and $\#[\neg A]$ are in $G(U)$. Because $\#[\neg A]$ is in $G(U)$, then $\#A$ is also in $F(U)$ by (3.1), and hence in $G(U) \cap F(U)$. But then, by Lemma 4.1, U is not consistent. Consequently, if U is consistent, then $G(U)$ is consistent. The proof that $F(U)$ is consistent if U is, is similar. □

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that U and V are consistent subsets of D, and that $U \subseteq V$. Then $G(U) \subseteq G(V)$ and $F(U) \subseteq F(V)$.*

Proof. Assume that U and V are consistent subsets of D, and that $U \subseteq V$. Let A be a sentence of L. By rule (r1) $\#A$ is in $G(U)$ and also in $G(V)$ iff $\#A$ is in W.
Let $\mathbf{n}$ be a numeral. If $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $G_0(U)$, then $\mathbf{n} = \lceil A \rceil$, where $\#A$ is in U. Because $U \subseteq V$, then $\#A$ is also in V, whence $\#T(\mathbf{n})$ is in $G_0(V)$. If $\#[\neg T(\mathbf{n})]$ is in $G_0(U)$, then $\mathbf{n} = \lceil A \rceil$, where $\#[\neg A]$ is in U. Because $U \subseteq V$, then $\#[\neg A]$ is also in V, whence $\#[\neg T(\mathbf{n})]$ is in $G_0(V)$.
If $\#[\exists x T(x)]$ is in $G_0(U)$, then U is nonempty. Because $U \subseteq V$, then also V is nonempty, whence $\#[\exists x T(x)]$ is in $G_0(V)$. Consequently, $\#[\exists x T(x)]$ is in $G_0(V)$ whenever it is in $G_0(U)$. The similar reasoning shows that $\#[\neg(\forall x \neg T(x))]$ is in $G_0(V)$ whenever it is in $G_0(U)$.
$\#[\exists x \neg T(x)]$ is in $G_0(U)$ iff $D_2(U)$ is nonempty, i.e., such a sentence A exists in $\mathcal{L}$ that $\#[\neg A]$ is in U. But then $\#[\neg A]$ is also in V, i.e., $D_2(V)$ is nonempty, whence $\#[\exists x \neg T(x)]$ is in $G_0(V)$. Similarly it can be shown that $\#[\neg \forall x T(x)]$ is in $G_0(V)$ whenever it in $G_0(U)$.
As consistent sets both U and V are proper subsets of D. Thus the Gödel numbers $\#[\forall x T(x)]$, $\#[\neg(\exists x \neg T(x))$,$\#[\neg \exists x T(x)]$ and $\#[\forall x \neg T(x)]$ are neither in $G_0(U)$ nor in $G_0(V)$.
The above results imply that $G_0(U) \subseteq G_0(V)$. Make an induction hypothesis:

(h1) $G_n(U) \subseteq G_n(V)$.

The definitions of the sets $G_n^k(U)$, $k = 1, \ldots, 9$, given in (2.3), together with (h1), imply that $G_n^k(U) \subseteq G_n^k(V)$ for each $k = 1, \ldots, 9$. Thus

$$G_{n+1}(U) = G_n(U) \cup \bigcup_{k=1}^{9} G_n^k(U) \subseteq G_n(V) \cup \bigcup_{k=1}^{9} G_n^k(V) = G_{n+1}(V).$$

Because (h1) is shown to hold when $n = 0$, then it holds for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.
If $\#A$ is in $G(U)$, it is by (2.5) in $G_n(U)$ for some n. Thus $\#A$ is in $G_n(V)$ by (h1), and hence in $G(V)$. Consequently, $G(U) \subseteq G(V)$.
If $\#A$ is in $F(U)$, it follows from (3.1) that $\#[\neg A]$ is in $G(U)$. Because $G(U) \subseteq G(V)$, then $\#[\neg A]$ is in $G(V)$ This implies by (3.1) that $\#A$ is in $F(V)$. Thus $F(U) \subseteq F(V)$. □

Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the family of all consistent subsets of the set D of Gödel numbers of sentences of $\mathcal{L}$. According to Lemma 4.2 the mapping $G := U \mapsto G(U)$ maps $\mathcal{P}$ into $\mathcal{P}$. Assuming that $\mathcal{P}$ is ordered by inclusion, it follows from Lemma 4.3 that G is order preserving.
In the formulation and the proof of Theorem 4.1 below transfinite sequences of $\mathcal{P}$ indexed by von Neumann ordinals are used. Such a sequence $(U_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \alpha}$ of $\mathcal{P}$ is said to be increasing if $U_\mu \subseteq U_\nu$ whenever $\mu \in \nu \in \alpha$, and strictly increasing if $U_\mu \subset U_\nu$ whenever $\mu \in \nu \in \alpha$.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume that $(U_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\alpha}$ a strictly increasing sequence of consistent subsets of D. Then*
(a) $(G(U_\lambda))_{\lambda\in\alpha}$ is an increasing sequence of consistent subsets of D.
(b) The set $U_\alpha = \bigcup_{\lambda\in\alpha} G(U_\lambda)$ is consistent.

Proof. (a) Consistency of the sets $G(U_\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \alpha$, follows from Lemma 4.2 because the sets U_λ, $\lambda \in \alpha$, are consistent.
Because $U_\mu \subset U_\nu$ whenever $\mu \in \nu \in \alpha$, then $G(U_\mu) \subseteq G(U_\nu)$ whenever $\mu \in \nu \in \alpha$, by Lemma 4.3, whence the sequence $(G(U_\lambda))_{\lambda\in\alpha}$ is increasing. This proves (a).
(b) To prove that the set $\bigcup_{\lambda\in\alpha} G(U_\lambda)$ is consistent, assume on the contrary that there exists such a sentence A in $\mathcal{L}$ that both $\#A$ and $\#[\neg A]$ are in $\bigcup_{\lambda\in\alpha} G(U_\lambda)$. Thus there exist μ, $\nu \in \alpha$ such that $\#A$ is in $G(U_\mu)$ and $\#[\neg A]$ is in $G(U_\nu)$. Because $G(U_\mu) \subseteq G(U_\nu)$ or $G(U_\nu) \subseteq G(U_\mu)$, then both $\#A$ and $\#[\neg A]$ are in $G(U_\mu)$ or in $G(U_\nu)$. But this is impossible, since both $G(U_\mu)$ and $G(U_\nu)$ are consistent by (a). Thus, the set $\bigcup_{\lambda\in\alpha} G(U_\lambda)$ is consistent, so that the conclusion of (b) holds. □

A subset V of D is called sound if $V \subseteq G(V)$. Let V be a subset of the set W of Gödel numbers of all those sentences of L which are true in the interpretation of L. Since L is an MA language, then W is consistent. Thus also V is consistent. Because $W = G_0(\emptyset) \subset G(\emptyset)$, then $V \subset G(\emptyset) \subseteq G(V)$. Thus V is also sound.
The following fixed point theorem is an application of Lemmas 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4, and is proved in [4].

Theorem 4.1. *If $V \in \mathcal{P}$ is sound, there exists the smallest of those fixed points of G which contain V. This fixed point is the last member of the union of those transfinite sequences $(U_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\alpha}$ of $\mathcal{P}$ which satisfy*

(C) $(U_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\alpha}$ is strictly increasing, $U_0 = V$, and if $0 \in \mu \in \alpha$, then $U_\mu = \bigcup_{\lambda\in\mu} G(U_\lambda)$.

The union $(U_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\gamma}$ of the transfinite sequences satisfying (C) can be characterized as follows (cf. [3]).

(I) $U_0 = V$. If λ is in γ, then $\lambda + 1$ is in γ iff $U_\lambda \subset G(U_\lambda)$, in which case $U_{\lambda+1} = G(U_\lambda)$.
If α is a limit ordinal, and λ is in γ for each $\lambda \in \alpha$, then α is in γ, and $U_\alpha = \bigcup_{\lambda\in\alpha} U_\lambda$.

It follows from (I) that the sequence $(U_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\gamma}$ begins with sets $U_0 = V$, $U_{n+1} = G(U_n)$, $n = 0, 1, \ldots$, $U_\omega = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} U_n$, $U_{\omega+n+1} = G(U_{\omega+n})$, $n = 0, 1, \ldots$, e.t.c., as long as the so defined sets exist and contain strictly previous sets. Because $(U_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\gamma}$ is a strictly increasing sequence of subsets of a countable set D, then γ is a countable ordinal. In this sense the smallest fixed point of G that contains V is determined by a countable recursion method. By [5, Corollary 3.1] this fixed point U is the smallest of all fixed points of G if V is a subset of W. Those sentences of $\mathcal{L}$ whose Gödel numbers are in U, or equivalently, in $G(U)$, and their negations, whose Gödel numbers belong by (r3) to $F(U)$, form an MA language $\mathcal{L}_0$ which contains its truth predicate.

References

[1] Chomsky, Noam (1957) Syntactic structures, The Hague: Mouton.

[2] Cohen, Paul (1963) *A minimal model for set theory*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society, **69**, 537–540.

[3] Heikkilä, S. (1999) *On chain methods used in fixed point theory*, Nonlinear Studies, **6**, 2, 171-180.

[4] Heikkilä, S. (2014) *What Mathematical Theories of Truth Should be Like (and Can be)*, Nonlinear Studies, **21**, 4, 591-599.

[5] Heikkilä, S. (2015) *A Mathematical Theory of Truth with Application to the Regress Problem*, Nonlinear Studies, **22**, 2, 307-315.

[6] Kunen, Kenneth (2009) The Foundations of Mathematics, Mathematical Logic and Foundations, **19**.

[7] Leitgeb, Hannes (2007) *What Theories of Truth Should be Like (but Cannot be)*, Philosophy Compass, **2/2**, 276–290.